DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 255 CG 002 080

By- Matson, Jane E.

EMERGING TRENDS IN JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK.

American Association of Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; American Coll. Personnel Association, Washington, D.C. Commission on Junior Coll. Student Personnel Programs.; American Personnel and Guidance Association, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 7 Apr 68

Note- 21p.; Speech prepared for Second Annual Workshop for Junior College Student Personnel Specialists, Detroit, Michigan, April 7, 1968.

EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $0.92

Descriptors- COUNSELING, INSERVICE EDUCATION, *INSERVICE PROGRAMS, *JUNIOR COLLEGES, ORGANIZATION, PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS, PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING, RESEARCH NEEDS, *STAFF UTILIZATION, *STUDENT PERSONNEL PROGRAMS, *STUDENT PERSONNEL SERVICES

Programs of professional preparation, the growth of professional identity, junior college practices, procedures, and policies, and an assortment of special projects are discussed. Junior colleges must assume more responsibility for the pre-service and in-service preparation of student personnel workers. Increased interest in, and by, professional associations requires junior college personnel to initiate and maintain productive relationships, to be best served by the organizations. Current practices in junior college student personnel work indicate a need for the centralization of organizational patterns, broadening of staffing patterns, direction change of the counseling function, imaginative student activities programs, the progress of developmental or remedial programs, and the encouragement of changes in student roles. Several special projects are discussed. Student personnel work needs to develop a stronger commitment to the basic philosophy of junior colleges, re-conceptualize student personnel purposes, and focus on research and evaluation. (WR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EMERGING TRENDS IN JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL WORK

Jane E. Matson - American Association of Junior Colleges

Prepared For
SECOND ANNUAL WORKSHOP FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT PERSONNEL SPECIALISTS
Detroit, Michigan
April 7, 1968

It has now been almost two years since Edmund J. Gleazer, Jr., Executive Director of the American Association of Junior Colleges, suggested that a follow-up to the two-year study of junior college student personnel programs (frequently referred to as the Carnegie Study) would be an appropriate next step toward the goal of improving the practice of student personnel work in junior colleges. A proposal was made to the Carnegie Corporation which had funded the first study, setting forth an ambitious program incorporating most of the recommendations made by the national committee in their final report on findings of the two-year study. A favorable response came from the Carnegie staff who reviewed the proposal but it was suggested that, before undertaking such an extensive program, a staff position at the headquarters office of the Association be established for the purpose of surveying the field in the light of the committee's recommendations and of establishing some priorities for the implementation of the recommendations which encompassed a broad area of activities. It was anticipated that with the establishment of this staff position, some pilot or exploratory projects might be undertaken and some judgments made about especially critical needs in the task of developing and improving student personnel work in junior colleges. In October, 1966, the Carnegie Corporation made available to AAJC a sum of money to carry out this project over a two-year period.

I was invited to fill this staff position with AAJC in their Washington office. I served in a part-time capacity during the fall of 1966 and started on a full-time basis February 1, 1967. It occurs to me that a report to the

CG 002 080
ED021255

profession is due and I was pleased when it was suggested as a topic for today's workshop.

It is difficult to evaluate the impact of this second Carnegie project on the junior college world. It has not been, in any sense, a research project with specific hypotheses, tight controls and rigidly designed procedures which would make possible precise evaluation. A wide variety of activities have been scheduled with a loosely-structured overall plan to focus on four general areas:

programs of professional preparation

growth of professionalism or professional identity among junior college student personnel workers

current developments in practices, procedures and policies, in the junior colleges

and an assortment of special projects.

I would like to report to you some developments that I see in each of these areas and in addition suggest some trends that I hope will become emergent in the immediate future.

I will not burden you here with a recital of my travels and experiences--although some of them might be of more interest than what I will report! It is sufficient to say that I have traveled to almost half of the states and have visited between 40 and 50 junior colleges--some just barely conceived, some newborn and some long-established. I have met with enrollees of six NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institutes, participated in meetings of local, state and national junior college and student personnel professional organizations. I have talked with innumerable individuals and groups about the mission of the comprehensive community junior college, the role of student personnel work in it and the problems which beset it as it moves toward its objectives.

It has been a rewarding experience, and one which has renewed and strengthened my conviction that the junior college, as an American social invention,

has an unparalleled opportunity to contribute to the goals of our society by the extension of educational opportunity to an ever-increasing proportion of our population. I am convinced that universal post-secondary education is just around the corner and that therein lies a possible alleviation of some of our pressing social problems. I am also of the opinion that the junior college <u>can</u> be the most significant educational medium to accomplish this--but some of what I have seen also gives rise to some disquieting thoughts--even doubts--that the junior college will be able to realize its destiny in this fashion--not because it does not have the potential--but because it will not choose to follow that particular destiny. I will say more about this later. I would like now to report to you some of the emerging trends as I have observed them in the four general areas I have outlined.

1. <u>Programs of Professional Preparation</u>

There are two major divisions of this area--pre-service and in-service--and while they are not entirely independent, they can be considered separately. The attention given by graduate schools across the country to the pre-service preparation needs of junior college personnel has increased markedly in the past three or four years. The extension of Title VB of the National Defense Education Act to include junior colleges and technical institutes provided a much-needed impetus to the development of programs specifically designed to meet the needs of the two-year college. At the start of the NDEA program, institutes frequently covered a combination of educational levels. One university was brave enough to design an academic year institute covering counseling and guidance through the entire range of education from kindergarten through graduate school. Institutes for secondary school personnel were frequently expanded to include junior college and technical institute personnel. Recently, junior college programs have been more frequently combined with institutes for higher education personnel although

there have been a significant number of both short-term and academic year programs designed solely for junior college and technical institute personnel. To date there has been no conclusive evaluation of the effect of these educational opportunities on student personnel work in junior colleges. But the institutes have become increasingly popular if the criterion of the number of applications received is a valid one. Institute directors have reported a marked increase in the number of inquiries and completed applications received.

From my observation, the success of these training programs has been directly related to the accessibility of junior colleges which were willing to act as resource consultants and to provide facilities for field or internship experience. It would be valuable in the planning of future programs to have a thorough investigation of the value of these NDEA Institutes as perceived by not only the enrollees but also by the administrators who employ them. The NDEA Institute program is coming to a close. The 1968-69 series will be the last under that legislation and this type of activity will be conducted under the new Education Professions Development Act starting in 1969.

The impression should not be given that the NDEA Institute program is the only source of pre-service training. A number of colleges and universities have evidenced interest in developing programs for the preparation of junior college student personnel workers. Some of them are already in operation, while others are still in the planning stages. One essential in the early stages of these developing programs is the direct involvement of junior college personnel. The graduate faculties include only a very small number of individuals who have first-hand, comprehensive knowledge of the junior college, its philosophy or its program. If these training programs are to have maximum utility for junior colleges, they must reflect an understanding of the unique qualities of

junior college education. Consultation with junior college personnel for the purpose of defining goals, objectives, appropriate content and techniques of professional preparation is essential. In addition, junior colleges must be willing to provide facilities and supervision for trainees in order to contribute the greatest reality to the training programs. I would urge junior colleges to be more aggressive in assuming their rightful role and to provide adequately in their budgets of both manpower and money for this added responsibility. There is little doubt that an increasing number of colleges and universities will become interested in serving junior colleges by providing appropriate professional preparation--in teaching as well as in student personnel work--and the junior colleges must be willing to assist them in all possible ways.

The picture with regard to in-service training is more confused. You will recall that this was one of the functions most poorly performed according to the first Carnegie study. While I am certain that there has been improvement, it is difficult to evaluate. Some of the NDEA Institutes served as means of up-grading persons already working in a junior college and there have been a sporadic assortment of workshops, conferences, institutes, some sponsored by professional organizations, some by colleges and universities and others by individual or groups of junior colleges. A basic problem is communication of information about these offerings and it is likely that they have not realized their complete potential in terms of benefit to junior college personnel.

Perhaps the most important resource of in-service training is the junior college itself and, even with less than adequate information, it seems obvious that colleges are not bearing their full burden of responsibility. It is under-standable since many colleges are completely occupied with just getting the "show on the road" and rapidly increasing enrollments in some have almost precluded the time and energy which should be devoted to in-service training. But, as with

all expenditures of time, energy and money, it is the value attached to the activity that determines the investment which will be made in it. And, it is difficult to conclude that the junior colleges, generally, have attached much importance to the function of in-service education of its staff.

It is my considered judgment that, while pre-service education will continue to be of importance, it is in the area of in-service education that the cause of junior college student personnel work will be won or lost. At the rate that junior colleges are increasing both in number and in size of enrollment, it is impossible for pre-service training programs to provide an adequate supply of student personnel workers. Therefore, available positions will have to be filled with less than ideally prepared staff. If this is so--and I do not see how it can help but be--in-service training becomes a matter of primary importance--if the ideal philosophy of the comprehensive community college is to be implemented. The developing institutions program under Title III of the Higher Education Act will provide some financial assistance for colleges which can qualify as 'developing.' It is anticipated that there will soon be funds available to assist newly established colleges in planning and development. But the great majority of colleges must rely on their own ingenuity, momentum and resources to meet the in-service training needs of their staff. I believe that the professional student personnel workers presently employed in junior colleges must bear the burden of responsibility for instigating, designing and implementing appropriate programs of in-service training. The new Education Professions Development Act gives promise of providing important help in financing such programs but the spade work that it takes to design programs and to see that they are carried out rests primarily with the junior colleges--and it must be noted that they will be competing for funds with all institutions of higher education and, in some

instances, with elementary and secondary schools as well. I commend to all of you the investigation of the EPDA guidelines which are now available and the serious consideration of proposals under this act.

2. Growth of Professionalism

Let me turn now to a brief review of the second area--the developing professionalism in our field. I can report to you, that there are hopeful signs on the horizon of an increase in professionalism in our field. The American College Personnel Association, which with AAJC sponsors this workshop, has given concrete evidence of its commitment to serve junior college personnel. The establishment of an Interest Group last year to provide a means of identifying those members who had special involvement with junior colleges, is one example of ACPA's concern. The newsletter--another joint project between AAJC and ACPA--has been generously supported by both organizations. After the first issue, over 400 letters were received from individuals who wished to be placed on the mailing list. To date about 2,500 copies of each issue are being distributed. The interest of professional organizations such as NASPA, NAWDC, ACCRAO, ACU-I, to name only a few, have taken steps to involve junior colleges more directly in their work.

As I have visited meetings of state and regional organizations, I find a growing awareness of junior colleges and their special role in post-secondary education accompanied by an increasing number of junior college personnel attendance at these sessions. Here, again, is an area which needs our special attention--the planning for released time and funds to permit attendance at professional conferences must originate with the professional student personnel workers themselves. If they do not ask to go with considerable insistence, it seems unlikely that they will be urged to do so--perhaps the old adage about the 'squeaking wheel getting the most grease' is appropriate here.

It seems likely, as junior colleges become more widespread and assume a larger role in post-secondary education, that professional organizations will become more cognizant of them and will seek to serve them. It will be the responsibility of junior college student personnel workers to interpret their roles and functions to these organizations so that they will be able to do a more adequate job of serving our profession. It is suggested as APGA State Branches increase in number and size and ACPA state divisions are established, that junior college personnel should assume leadership roles as early as possible so that the organizations will reflect the professional characteristics and needs of junior college student personnel workers. The eventual record in the move toward professionalization of junior college student personnel work will depend on not only the response of gestures of welcome and concern made to us by the numerous professional organizations but also on the extent to which we participate in eliciting such gestures.

3. Current Practices

It is not easy to describe to you the developments in the third area--student personnel practices in junior colleges. It is impossible in only a little more than a year to get more than a very general impression of what is happening in junior colleges across the country. I have tried to observe a sample of junior college development but I lay no claim to the adequacy of that sampling procedure. It is even more difficult to select the areas of development to report. But--for whatever they may be worth--here are some of my observations.

a. Organizational Patterns

Here there seems to be an unmistakable trend toward centralization of student personnel functions and the responsibility for them. The 'umbrella' type of administrative structure which groups related student personnel functions is becoming more common. The chief administrator of these functions is called

by many and varied titles--ranging from Dean of Students, Dean of Student Services, Dean of Student Personnel, Vice President of Student Affairs--to suggest only a few. Whatever he or she may be called (and I might add there are amazingly few women carrying this responsibility), there is an increasing likelihood that he will be supervising most, if not all, of the services traditionally classified as student personnel. There is also an increasing probability--although by no means, as yet, a certainty--that he will be responsible directly to the chief administrator of the college--and thereby reflect the recognition by the college of the senior partnership of the student personnel area with the instructional function.

b. Staffing Patterns

An increasing number of staff positions in the student personnel areas are full-time assignments. In smaller colleges it is common to find one position combining a number of functions until the college is of sufficient size and the program has been developed to the point where separation is warranted. The number of levels of supervision vary and is related to the overall pattern of the college administrative structure. It is common in larger colleges to find two levels of supervisory positions within the student personnel area with counseling usually the first function to have a separate supervisory position created.

One development, embryonic as yet, but one which holds great promise, is the use of sub-professionals and in student personnel staffs. I believe that the tremendous shortage of well-qualified professional staff which inevitably lies ahead, can be alleviated by the proper and judicious use of appropriately trained support personnel. At least one large urban junior college is considering the establishment of a two-year Associate in Arts degree program to prepare "student personnel aides." The design and implementation of this curriculum is a challenge

but I am confident it can be done. This is an exciting development and one which may very well have great impact on the practitioners of student personnel work in junior colleges. Here, again, I believe we have prime responsibility to participate actively in the definition of this new job appearing on the horizon, and to assist with the task of designing a curriculum to prepare people to fill the job.

The problem of the use or non-use of faculty as academic advisers has not yet been resolved. The practice of assigning staff as part-time teachers and part-time student personnel workers is declining. But in many junior colleges, faculty are assigned advisement duties, usually in addition to a full-time teaching assignment. A sort of pendulum or cyclical phenomenon can be observed. In some of the newer junior colleges, faculty are asked to assume this counseling-related function on the premise that there is insufficient money or staff to do otherwise and everyone must "pitch in and help" in order to get the job done. As the college grows in size and budget, it is not uncommon for the advisement function to be shifted entirely to the counseling staff. The next stage of development occurs when the faculty are again given the responsibility for academic advisement. At this point the rationale is likely to be that this system facilitates good faculty-counselor relationships or that it facilitates faculty-student communication or that it is impossible to maintain a reasonable counselor-student ratio without resorting to a faculty advisement system. There is also the argument that faculty are generally better equipped to provide superior advisement service to that of the professional counselor. Perhaps each of these is a reasonable hypothesis but, to my knowledge, neither have been well evaluated and, therefore, remain merely hypotheses with only vague and questionable data to support them. What is needed is a good evaluative study of the advantages

and disadvantages of the use of faculty advisers in a variety of college settings. Until this is done I fear we will continue to swing on the pendulum and be forced to rely on opinions, frequently more emotional than rational, to justify our points of view.

c. Counseling

There is no doubt that counseling is considered to be the key student personnel service. Indeed, to many, it is synonymous with student personnel. It is the one function in which there is readily identifiable expertise and well established training programs to provide the essential skills and knowledge. In this sense it is the most professionalized of all student personnel functions and thereby occupies a central position in the total student personnel field.

"Counseling and guidance" has been widely accepted as one of the four or five basic functions of a junior college. Since "guidance" is a vague term subject to many different interpretations, it has been largely ignored in the public perception and counseling has borne the major responsibility for implementing the counseling and guidance function of the junior college. Traditionally, counseling in the junior college has differed markedly from counseling in the four-year college. In the junior college, counseling usually has been defined as a service for all students; is focused on vocational and educational decision-making and is the major means of accomplishing the appropriate distribution of students among the curricula offered by the college. The counseling center concept found in the four-year college has only recently appeared in junior colleges. But, I regret to report, that it seems to be spreading. In part this may reflect a shortage of well-trained counselors and a consequent necessity to re-define their job in the junior college setting. Another factor may be an almost over-professionalization of the counseling role, leading to the attitude that such mundane, common problems as choice of curriculum or choice of college of transfer, or even choice of a vocational objective are

not worthy of a truly 'professional' counselor's time which, instead, should be spent in assisting the student with in-depth investigation of personality aberrations of a more or less clinical nature. Please do not infer that I do not believe that many college students could profit from therapy or that it is entirely inappropriate for a junior college to provide such service. The question I raise is what is lost when that is ALL that the junior college provides in the way of counseling service and that to only a very small proportion of its students?

An important trend in the counseling area which deserves more time than available here is the rapid and extensive increase in group work. This is our latest 'fad'--group work is seen by the administrator frequently as an economical method of spreading the available counseling talent and is seen by many counselors as the panacea to all their problems as well as their clients'. In reality, group counseling is an effective technique when used by compentent practitioners and can provide an important dimension to a counseling service. Because it can be effective, I am pleased to report that it is receiving widespread attention in junior colleges. A word of caution--it is not a panacea, is not universally appropriate, and in the hands of incompetents, may constitute a dangerous weapon. I would urge continued exploration of its value, experimentation with its use and careful evaluation of its outcomes.

Positions defined as involving strictly "vocational counseling" are appearing in junior colleges with increasing frequency. They represent an effort to force the attention of the counselor to the problems of vocational choices rather than an emphasis on more or less deep-seated emotional problems. As one who finds it impossible to offer vocational counseling without also involving educational and personal decision-making, I do not believe it will be possible to provide counseling services in water tight compartments. But it should be

noted that the trend in this direction is in great part due to the failure of junior college counselors to deal adequately with students in need of help in making decisions about vocations.

d. Activities Programs

Perhaps it is my faulty observation, but I am unable to see much of a positive nature to report in this area of student personnel work. This is deplorable because here is perhaps the area of greatest potential outside the classroom for providing significant experiences for students. It seems unfortunate that most junior colleges have followed the traditional pattern of activities programs found in the four-year college which is simply not appropriate to meet the needs of the diverse two-year college student population. With only a few exceptions, I must report that I have seen little that is innovative, or even relevant, in either student government or in activities programs in junior colleges. Admittedly, it is difficult to design and build a program which demonstrates for the student a relationship between what he learns in the classroom and his out-of-class hours. In all too many situations, staff members are well-intentioned and kindly but are ill-equipped to conceptualize an extra-curricular program so that it becomes meaningful to the students as well as to the faculty who are often simply contemptuous of the 'fun and games' approach.

This is an area of our profession which has been too long neglected in both preparation programs in imaginative practice. As a result, generations of students have been short-changed in what could be an important laboratory for significant learning of attitudes and skills for everyday living. There is much work to be done if the out-of-classroom program is to be a significant factor in achieving the purpose of student personnel work in a junior college.

e. Developmental or Remedial Programs

An area in which I can be more optimistic is that of developmental or basic education--or what is often referred to as remedial education. Some of you may not consider this properly placed in the student personnel area but I believe that the professional student personnel worker has an important responsibility in these programs. It is, of course, a shared responsibility since the instructional staff should be involved. Only rarely is the remedial function carried out solely by the student personnel staff and then, usually, because the faculty is disinterested or has actually refused to participate.

The job of a comprehensive community junior college is to provide appropriate educational opportunities within its legally constituted framework for all who seek its help. This is admittedly an idealistic position and difficult to implement but efforts must be made if the junior college is to justify its existence. This is especially true in the large urban areas where the young adults of the inner city have no educational opportunity and are consequently unable to break out of the straitjackets of ignorance, poverty and despair which confine them. Here is where developmental education can be most helpful but it is too often unpalliative and rejected even if available. The primary task of the student personnel specialist is to interpret to the instructional staff, the characteristics of the students and their implications for the learning process. Only in this way is it likely that educational programs can be developed which have some reasonable chance of being successfully completed by the disadvantaged student. It should not be assumed that the need for developmental programs is limited to large cities or to areas of acute poverty. Educational disadvantagement is more likely to occur there but it is by no means limited to those settings.

There is much ferment in this field and there is good hope that progress is being made. The Urban Community College projects now under way in Oakland,

California, Los Angeles, Chicago and New York with Office of Economic Opportunity funds and coordinated by Dr. Dorothy Knoell of the AAJC staff are good examples. Numerous junior colleges across the country are experimenting with a variety of programs designed to meet the needs of students who are inadequately equipped to develop their potential strengths. While progress is often slow and must be measured in small increments, the largest degree of success has been in those programs which have involved the active partnership of student personnel workers.

f. Role of Students

No report of emerging trends in higher education would be complete without reference to the changes now taking place in the role of the student in his relationships with other members of the college community. Junior colleges generally have escaped the more serious confrontations which have taken place on some campuses. But it would be unwise to assume that some of the same forces which contribute to the disruptive behavior are not present on many junior college campuses. The fact that junior college students are on the whole less articulate, more conservative and less likely to take strong partisan positions than their four-year college compatriots, does not mean that they would not benefit from the educational advantages of direct participation and involvement in the major issues confronting colleges and college students.

There is a rapid and marked increase in the number of colleges which are making some effort to involve students in the policy making process and in the formal governance of the colleges. In a sizable number of colleges, students are becoming full voting members of official college committees responsible for policy recommendations. In other colleges, there is less formal student participation in many phases of college governance.

The Joint Statement on Student Rights and Freedoms is being examined on a number of college campuses by students, faculty and administrators to determine what changes might make it more applicable to the junior college setting. It is to be hoped that before long all colleges will either have adopted the Joint Statement or prepare their own version. The consultation process by which the final document is developed is as important as the final document itself.

There can be little doubt that students are asking and receiving more attention, more consideration and are more actively participating in the day-to-day operation of many colleges. It is peculiarly appropriate that this should be occurring in the junior college which has long claimed to be "student centered."

The student personnel worker has a facilitating role to play in this process. For many reasons too numerous to detail here, the junior college student has need of help as he "tries on for size" his new-found rights and freedoms accompanied by their inevitable responsibilities. And faculty and administrators can use assistance in acquiring the necessary skills and knowledge which will enable them to understand the students and their behavior. The junior college has an excellent opportunity to provide leadership in these efforts to make education more relevant and meaningful to the student.

There are other areas I might touch on in which there is much activity. Housing and its concomitant educational values is receiving attention on an increasing number of campuses where there has been previously only a commuting student population. The areas of health service, financial aids, and job placement are also emerging as increasingly significant functions in junior college student personnel programs.

4. Special Projects

But I must move on to the last area of focus, that of special projects.

These have been reported in the Junior College Journal and the newsletter and time does not permit a detailed description here. Let me just report that the major test companies are proceeding well with their special projects. The next major publication will be a synthesis of available data on the characteristics of junior college students which has been prepared by Dr. K. Patricia Cross of the Educational Testing Service. It is anticipated that this will be available for distribution about May 1. The pamphlet entitled, "Premises: Planning Student Personnel Facilities", which describes a conference sponsored by AAJC held last spring to explore the relationships between the nature of physical facilities and junior college student personnel philosophy, has been well received. In January, a pilot workshop was held in which a small group devoted its attention to the nature of the consulting process, it pitfalls and its rewards.

There are additional activities either now in progress or in the planning stages which might be reported. But I hope I have sketched for you, a picture of sufficient detail and color to give an impression of the dynamics of our professional field as I see them after some 18 months of observation.

In closing I would like to suggest some trends which I do not see emerging. Because these developments are not taking place or are deficient, student personnel work is less adequate and less likely to make its maximum contribution to student life. Their absence is also related to the threat I alluded to earlier to the complete fulfillment of the junior college as the major vehicle for the extension of educational opportunity to all of our citizens. I would suggest three areas in which I have not seen as much emerging strength as will be needed if the junior college is to realize its potentials.

(1) There must be a stronger commitment to the basic philosophy of the junior college and an unwavering faith in its potential to be many more things to many more people than it has yet demonstrated. While it is relatively easy to

pay lip service to the concept of the open door admission policy and all that it implies, I see in my travels around the country all too willing a readiness to settle for so-called academic excellence in the transfer program and neglect or actually reject the other highly-touted-but-difficult-to-implement functions of the junior college. Unless we who are spending our professional lives in the junior college are strong and steadfast in our convictions, it is unlikely that we can be convincing to others.

(2) There is some evidence that our own understanding of the place of student personnel work in the junior college mission is not as clear as it should be. And because we are not clear about this, we fail in making it clear to governing boards, administrators, faculty members, students and the general public. I would suggest that the field of student personnel is in need of some serious soul-searching and reappraisal which may lead to re-conceptualization of its purposes and the most effective ways to achieve them. The rather hazy and sometimes almost invisible relationship between student personnel work and the curriculum, needs to be re-defined and established with vigor and skill. Perhaps the professional student personnel worker will emerge as a resource consultant to the faculty in the area of learning theory; perhaps another dimension of his role would be as facilitator of learning and interpretation for the student; or perhaps he will assume the role of an agent of change, contributing to the development of more effective learning situations. Whatever ultimate roles evolve, it is high time we begin this re-definition for it may be a long and painful process but without it I believe we may eventually lose our chance to play the senior partner role.

(3) The third area in which additional strength is essential if junior colleges are to survive, is that of research and evaluation. The acute needs in this area are not unique to student personnel functions but for our purposes today, I will limit my comments to that field.

Every day there are decisions made in junior colleges which make important differences in the lives of all members of the college community. Many of these decisions are made with entirely inadequate data or without consideration of information which is available. Educational decision-making is too likely to be the result of crystal-ball gazing, ouija board manipulation, off-the-top-of-the-head judgments, or simply blind faith in tradition. This is not necessarily the result of unskilled or poorly informed individuals making the decisions. More often, the data pertinent to the problems at hand are simply not available.

Information about students is especially sparse. Most junior colleges do not describe their students in any terms other than such dimensions as number, sex, other identifying data and academic ability level. Yet available resource indicates that these are not the most pertinent or significant information that would be of assistance in planning educational experiences which will lead to success for students. Here is the root of our disgracefully high attrition rates as well as of other problems which plague us.

Not only do we need more data about students--we need more information about the community, its occupational structure, its socioeconomic dimensions, the elements of the college environment, its impact on students--to name only a few factors which are too rarely studied.

But data alone are not enough. They must be interpreted in the light of a particular situation or problem. There must be a willingness to change, to develop policies and procedures which reflect our best judgments about the meaning of the data and to remain flexible enough to change again when we have evidence that the situation has changed or that our interpretations of the data did not hit the target. Only if we maintain this kind of resiliency will our research efforts have meaning.

This means that we must be willing to expand the necessary time and money

to buy the skills required to design and carry out programs of evaluation of all student personnel services. Our objectives must be defined in as measurable terms as we can discover and we must work at this difficult task constantly. I hope that we will be able to develop much better criteria and methods for evaluation--I would hate to be forced to settle for what is a rather miserable record to date in our evaluation of the elements which make up our student personnel programs.

These, then, are the trends and issues in junior college student personnel work as I see them. It is a kaleidoscopic picture, with complex designs and configurations, not always eary to interpret, and with changing patterns of light and darkness--but far from hopeless. My strong conviction is that the comprehensive community junior college will, in large part, succeed or fail as a means of democratizing educational opportunity on the basis of how these issues are met and the directions the trends may take. This is an awesome responsibility for the members of the student personnel profession.

The other factor which will determine the future of the junior college is the curriculum and the teaching methods used to implement it. Without adequate diversity, and relevancy in curricular offerings, we cannot hope to effect the extension of educational opportunity to all citizens which the junior college so boldly promises. The student personnel specialist must provide leadership in the development of appropriate information about students, the interpretation of its implications for learning, the design of curricula to fit the dimensions and contour of student groups and the development of a close working relationship with the teaching faculty and students as they strive to reach their mutual objectives. The role of investigator, interpreter, facilitator and team member may modify the traditional role of the student personnel worker. Some remodeling--and it may be drastic rebuilding--is in order if our profession is to survive.

The junior college cannot afford to rest on its laurels--there is some question if it has <u>any</u> laurels to rest on--and the events of the past several days have heaped new evidence before us of the inadequacy of our efforts to date.

The time we have to improve our record may not be long. But I have seen enough from my observation post of the past two years to believe that we can do it--if we only determine that we will and start on the tortuous and difficult path. But the rewards and satisfactions if we achieve even a modicum of success will be well worth our efforts.